

In one sense, the attempt to incorporate biophysics and biochemistry into the journal ended in failure. In a 1960 report as resident editors to the other editors (30 April 1960), Porter and Palade, in the context of looking toward the future, raised the question of dropping *biophysical* and *biochemical* from the name of the journal:

First, again, is the problem of scope . . . As part of this it might be good to consider changing the name of the Journal, so that it more adequately describes the content, as it is now and will probably be. When the present title was decided upon, there was no *Journal of Biophysics*, and no *Journal of Molecular Biology*, and no weekly, publishing *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*. As long as it makes space for them, the *J.B.B.C.* will continue to get a few manuscripts that might just as readily be published in one of these others or in *Biochemica [et] Biophysica Acta*.¹²

(Because that summer Palade wrote a letter to Porter opposing the name change¹³ and cast the only vote against changing the name, it is likely that this statement represented only Porter's view.) At the 1961 meeting of the editors the name *Journal of Cell Biology* was proposed because it "better defines the purpose and scope of the Journal and is less cumbersome than the present one."

Porter formally canvassed the editors on the question of a name change in a letter of 23 June 1961 and put forward his own arguments for changing the name. He noted that the original name was a compromise, and not one that everyone endorsed: "The Journal was given its present name at the insistence of a few of the founding editors." It was chosen "to discourage a predicted flood of papers on pure morphology." While acknowledging that the choice of name may have brought a few papers properly characterized as "biophysical," Porter commented, in a pointed dig at Francis Schmitt, "Among these, it may be added, there was never one from the editor who insisted with greatest vehemence that 'biophysical' be included."¹⁴ He also identified as a factor accounting for the paucity of submissions that were biophysical or

¹² Folder 3, Box 1, RU 518, Rockefeller University Archives, RAC.

¹³ In a letter to Porter on 27 June 1961, Palade offered two reasons for keeping the name – the journal had already obtained a positive reputation with the name and the adjectives *biophysical* and *biochemical* characterize the trend in the field. He contended that the name *cell biology* represented "to a certain extent, a withdrawal to a more conservative position centered on cell structure and cell physiology in the traditional sense." He then proposed yet another alternative: *Cellular and Subcellular Biology*. (Folder 11, Box 1, RU 518, Rockefeller University Archives, RAC.)

¹⁴ Schmitt did publish one paper in the journal, a short note presenting electron micrographs of ultracentrifuge preparation of paramyosin (Locker & Schmitt, 1957).